

Legislative Analysis



BIDS ON STATE PRINTING JOBS

Mary Ann Cleary, Director
Phone: (517) 373-8080
<http://www.house.mi.gov/hfa>

Senate Bill 1055 (reported as Substitute H-1)

Sponsor: Sen. Tom Casperson

(Enacted as Public Act 562 of 2013)

House Committee: Michigan Competitiveness

Senate Committee: Reforms, Restructuring and Reinventing

Complete to 12-15-14

A SUMMARY OF SENATE BILL 1055 AS REPORTED FROM HOUSE COMMITTEE

Public Act 153 of 1937 requires, with some exceptions, that printing paid for by state government be printed within the state. Senate Bill 1055 would eliminate that requirement.

However, the bill requires that, all other things being equal, preference be given to printing offered by Michigan-based firms or facilities "with respect to which the operator is designated as a clean corporate citizen under Part 14 of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act."

The act also currently allows the state-owned printing operation in the State Prison of Southern Michigan to be exempt from the act's bidding requirements but only to the extent that it carries out printing for its own operations. The bill would amend this to specify that the prison—the G. Robert Cotton Correctional Facility—can carry out printing operations for the entire Department of Corrections.

Also, under the act, with certain exceptions, state-funded printing must bear the label of the branch of the Allied Printing Trades Council of the locality in which the printing is done. One exception to this is when a printing firm does not have the use of that label. In that case, the bidder must demonstrate they are a "responsible bidder"; this includes filing a sworn statement that employees are receiving the prevailing wage rate and working under conditions prevalent in the locality where the work is produced. The bill would amend this exception to make it, and the associated conditions, apply when the printing firm does not have "the use of the Allied Printing Trades Council union label in the locality in which it is printed." (The underlined portion is new language.)

[The act notes that the printing requirement does not apply to state-funded printing for primary school districts, counties, townships, cities, villages, or legal publication ordered for or by elective state officers. There are also special provisions for Legislative printing, including bills and resolutions, which much be printed or reproduced under the specifications, terms, and conditions considered necessary by the Legislative Council.]

MCL 24.61

FISCAL IMPACT:

The bill would have an indeterminate impact on state government. There could be a cost savings if out-of-state printing companies gave a lower bid than Michigan companies and they met the bidding requirements of the act. Since bids can vary by project, it is not possible to project any possible savings that could result, if there were to be any savings at all by choosing an out-of-state printing firm.

There would be no impact to local government under the bill.

Legislative Analyst: Chris Couch
Fiscal Analyst: Perry Zielak

■ This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan House staff for use by House members in their deliberations, and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.